

Appl. No. 10/649,005  
Response dated September 24, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 25, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-7, 13 and 15-21 remain in the application. Claims 2, 8-12 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-7, 13 and 15 stand rejected. Claims 16-21 are newly presented.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that a mounting surface of the device has "recesses at side edges of the device", that each of a plurality of electrical contacts "extends from an interior portion of the mounting surface and terminates in one of said recesses", and that "said recesses and electrical contacts are sized to provide offsets between said mounting surface and said electrical contacts." Support for these amendments is found, at least, on p. 8, lines 2-8, and in FIGS. 4A-12.

Claims 3-7 have been amended to better set forth their limitations, but are believed to conform to the intent of the original claims.

New claim 16 reads on FIGS. 8A & 9A, as well as the description on p. 12, line 8 – p. 13, line 32. New claim 17 reads on FIGS. 6A & 7A, as well as the description on p. 10, line 9 – p. 12, line 6. New claim 18 reads on FIGS. 4A, 5A, 8A & 9A. New claim 19 reads on FIGS. 6A & 7A. New claim 20 is supported in the same manner as claim 1 and, additionally, on p. 7, lines 11-17. New claim 21 reads on FIG. 13.

None of the above amendments or new claims are believed to add new matter.

#### 1. Rejection of Claims 1 and 4 Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 5,821,615).

As amended, applicants' claim 1 recites that a plurality of electrical contacts conform to recesses at "side edges" of a device. Applicants' amended claim 1 further recites that each of a plurality of electrical contacts "extends from an interior portion of the mounting surface and terminates in one of said recesses", and that "said recesses and electrical contacts are sized to provide offsets between said mounting surface and said electrical contacts." The combination of these elements is not

Appl. No. 10/649,005  
Response dated September 24, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 25, 2004

taught by any of the references, including Lee. Applicants' claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable.

Applicants' claim 4, as well as claim 5-7, 13 and 15-19, are believed to be allowable at least because they depend from applicants' claim 1.

## 2. Rejection of Claims 3 and 5-7 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 5,821,615) in view of Minamio et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,020; hereinafter "Minamio"). However, applicants' claims 3 and 5-7 are believed to be allowable at least because they depend from applicants' claim 1, and because Lee, in combination with Minamio, fails to teach or suggest the combined limitations of applicants' amended claim 1.

It is also noted that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, many of the grooves and recesses 11, 12, etc. shown in Minamio's FIGS. 17a are not have electrical contacts conforming thereto. Rather, these grooves and recesses are part of a die and package support structure, and are unrelated to device or package "electrical contacts".

## 3. Rejection of Claims 13 and 15 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 5,821,615) in view of admitted prior art. However, applicants' claims 13 and 15 are believed to be allowable at least because they depend from applicants' claim 1, and because Lee, in combination with what is known in the art, fails to teach or suggest the combined limitations of applicants' amended claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/849,005  
Response dated September 24, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 25, 2004

#### 4. New Claims 16-21


New claims 16-19 are believed to be allowable at least because they depend from applicants' claim 1.

New claims 20 & 21 are believed to be allowable at least for reasons similar to why applicants' claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Claims 20 & 21 are also believed to be allowable because the art of record does not show a "conductive adhesive, electrically and mechanically coupling each electrical contact of the surface mountable electronic device to a corresponding pad on the printed circuit board, *the conductive adhesive being substantially confined to said recesses*" (emphasis added).

#### 5. Conclusion

In light of the amendments and remarks provided herein, applicants respectfully request the timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.



By: \_\_\_\_\_

Gregory W. Osterloth  
Reg. No. 36,232  
Tel: (303) 291-3200